



JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK  
Acting Assistant Attorney General  
MARCIA BERMAN  
Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch  
KATHRYN L. WYER (Utah Bar No. 9846)  
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division  
1100 L Street, N.W., Room 12014  
Tel. (202) 616-8475  
kathryn.wyer@usdoj.gov  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,  
*et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ELISABETH DEVOS, in her official capacity  
as Secretary of Education, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:20-cv-455-EJD

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
ex rel. Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of  
California,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BETSY DEVOS, in her official capacity as  
Secretary of Education, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:20-cv-1889-EJD

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR  
PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION**

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendants respectfully request leave to file the attached proposed reply in support of their motion for partial reconsideration of the Court's Order of September 3, 2020. Defendants have reviewed the memoranda in opposition to Defendants'

1 motion, filed on October 22, 2020, by Plaintiffs in each of the above-captioned cases and believe  
2 that a short reply brief is warranted in order to address mischaracterizations in Plaintiffs'  
3 memoranda of controlling and persuasive authorities and of Defendants' positions. Defendants  
4 further state the following in support of their motion for leave:

5 In its Order of September 3, 2020, the Court granted in part and denied in part  
6 Defendants' motions to dismiss the above-captioned cases. On September 15, 2020, Defendants  
7 filed a motion for leave to file a motion for partial reconsideration. At the case management  
8 conference held on October 1, 2020, the Court granted Defendants' motion for leave and  
9 indicated that it would allow Plaintiffs to file memoranda in opposition to Defendants' motion for  
10 partial reconsideration but would not schedule a reply brief for Defendants. Instead, the Court  
11 indicated that, if Defendants wished to file a reply brief after reviewing Plaintiffs' opposition  
12 briefs, Defendants should seek leave to do so at that time. In accord with the Court's direction, the  
13 parties conferred and stipulated that Plaintiffs' memoranda in opposition would be filed by  
14 October 22, 2020. Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases separately filed memoranda in  
15 opposition on the dockets of their respective cases on that date.

16 Having reviewed Plaintiffs' memoranda, Defendants seek leave to file the attached  
17 combined reply brief, less than eight pages in length, in further support of their motion for partial  
18 reconsideration. In particular, Defendants seek to identify and correct mischaracterizations of case  
19 law, and of Defendants' positions, in Plaintiffs' memoranda. Particularly given that Defendants'  
20 motion concerns the Court's subject matter jurisdiction and that California continues to advance a  
21 novel theory of standing for claims under the Administrative Procedure Act without  
22 acknowledging that their theory is in fact novel, Defendants believe their submission of a reply  
23 brief could be helpful to the Court. It is within the Court's discretion to authorize this filing.<sup>1</sup>

---

24 <sup>1</sup> Undersigned counsel for Defendants has conferred with counsel for Plaintiffs, who stated that  
25 they would not stipulate to the filing of a reply and requested that Defendants state their position  
26 as follows: "Plaintiffs in the *AFT* and *California* matters ("Plaintiffs") oppose this motion. At the  
27 October 1, 2020 hearing, the Court unambiguously expressed its inclination to limit further  
28 briefing, and suggested that Plaintiffs be mindful of that guidance in opposing the Motion for

1 Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant Defendants leave to file  
2 the attached reply and order the Clerk of Court to entered the attached as filed on the dockets of  
3 each of the above-captioned cases.

4 DATED: October 30, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

5 JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK  
6 Acting Assistant Attorney General

7 MARCIA BERMAN  
8 Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch

9 /s/ Kathryn L. Wyer  
10 KATHRYN L. WYER (Utah Bar No. 9846)  
11 U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division  
12 1100 L Street, N.W., Room 12014  
13 Tel. (202) 616-8475  
14 kathryn.wyer@usdoj.gov  
15 *Attorneys for Defendants*

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Partial Reconsideration. Plaintiffs limited their respective Opposition briefs accordingly. No reply  
24 is warranted under these circumstances.” *See also* Declaration of Kathryn Wyer, attached hereto.  
25 Contrary to Plaintiffs’ suggestion, the Court’s statement at the CMC about limiting further  
26 briefing related primarily to whether Plaintiffs were allowed, in their opposition brief, to address  
27 issues beyond those raised in Defendants’ motion. The Court indicated that Plaintiffs’ opposition  
28 brief should not introduce new issues. In accord with that direction, Defendants’ short proposed  
reply does not seek to introduce new issues but instead seeks to respond to Plaintiffs’ briefing.